TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Format of Regional Workshops	5
3. Summary of Responses	6
4. Interviews of Parolees	52
5. Summary of Responses from Interviews	53
Appendix A - List of Organizations Providing Written Responses	62
Appendix B - List of Participants at Regional Workshops	63
Appendix C - List of 16 Issues from Discussion Paper	73
Appendix D - Initiatives as Reported by CSC and NPB at Workshops	75
Appendix E - Glossary of Terms	78
Appendix F - Interview Questions with Parolees	79
Appendix G - Parolee Interviews: First Names, Locations, Dates	80
Appendix H - List of Project Team Members	81

1. INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared as a result of eight regional consultations held across Canada, written responses to the Project's "Discussion Paper", and interviews conducted with inmates or those on conditional release in the Ontario Region.

The Discussion Paper was based on the proceedings of a workshop held in Hull, Quebec, in March of 1987, with representatives from the federal, provincial and private sectors. A number of issues and questions related to the preparation of standards for community supervision were identified in the Discussion Paper. It also included reference to questions raised by Coroner's Jury in Ottawa in May, 1987, in the investigation of the murder of a halfway house employee.

The Discussion Paper was distributed in November, 1987, to a wide number of agencies, organizations and individuals in the criminal justice system in Canada - the Heads of Corrections of the provinces and territories, provincial boards of parole, all CSC parole offices, institutions and regional headquarters, NPB regional offices, CSC Citizens' Advisory Committees, the National Joint Committee of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and Federal Corrections Services and their regional committee members, nine victims of violence groups, private sector agencies (including provincial and national offices), providing conditional release supervision under contract to the Correctional Service of Canada or to the Alberta Solicitor General's Correctional Services Division, the Union of Solicitor General Employees, the Canadian Criminal Justice Association, the National Liaison Committee, the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice, the Criminal Lawyers Association, and the representatives from the provinces and territories who participated in the Hull workshop. Recipients were invited to respond in writing before December 31, 1987. Forty-five responses were received and these are listed in Appendix A.

Regional Consultation

Originally the Project Team had not planned regional workshops for the Discussion Paper but at a Team meeting in October, questions were raised as to how effective our consultation would be on the various issues based on written responses. There was a strong feeling amongst a number of members that by meeting face-to-face with our partners involved in community supervision,

that we could have a more meaningful dialogue. Accordingly, with the approval and support of the Steering Committee (Commissioner, Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) and Chairman, National Parole Board (NPB); the Deputy Commissioner, Offender Policy and Programs Development; and the Executive Director, NPB), regional workshops were planned and held in Halifax (January 25), Toronto (January 27 and 28), Winnipeg (February 1), Edmonton (February 3), Vancouver (February 4), and Laval (March 4). The names of the participants are listed in Appendix B.

It is important to note here that the Project Team experienced a high level of interest and participation in these meetings which was of real value to our work. The constructive criticism, the insights from field practitioners and the managers of the agencies and organizations, plus a commitment to improve, as need be, the present standards, was most impressive.

On behalf of the Project Team and Don Storch, our consultant, I would like to express our thanks to the people who took the time to respond in writing, who were involved in our workshops and those offenders and ex-offenders who were interviewed.

If you have any questions, comments or suggestions about this round of consultations or our future plans, please contact me.

John H. Lawrence, Project Team Leader
Correctional Service of Canada (Parole)
40 Baker Street, Suite 101
Guelph, Ontario
N1H 4G1

(519) 821-2250

2. FORMAT OF THE REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS

In the letter of invitation, each participant was asked to bring his/her copy of the Discussion Paper and was given a list of the 16 issues (Appendix C) from this document.

The first half-hour of each meeting was spent by the Project Team and the Consultant in introductions, a brief historical outline of the project, an update on present initiatives by the NPB and CSC which could influence our work (Appendix D) and a short presentation on Models A, B and C as described in the Discussion Paper. Prior to the opening, there was a handout on the definition of a "standard" and a "guideline".

The Chairman reviewed the work plan of the project as (previously) approved by the Steering Committee.

Each participant was then asked for his/her views on the relevancy of the project and overall comments on the Discussion Paper.

The workshop then continued with a systematic discussion on each of the sixteen issues already identified by the Team. Time was available at the conclusion of the workshop for identification and discussion of other issues from individuals or organizations.

At each workshop, two Project Team members were assigned the responsibility for the recording of the responses.

In Vancouver, due to the numbers, two sessions were held simultaneously.

3. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

GENERAL COMMENTS AND REACTION TO DISCUSSION PAPER

- The project team will likely find a lot of disparity in the quality of supervision as well as in the quality of relationships across the country. The level of quality will have to be evaluated.
- The attitude towards the application of special conditions is also different between regions (examples given were the Prairies and Atlantic regions).
- There is a need for National Parole Board and Correctional Service of Canada to be consistent in the policy and procedures now detailed in separate manuals.
- The questions (issues) outlined for discussion hit the mark and should be addressed.
- The project team must be careful to evaluate the calibre of supervisors across the country because it might reflect which options will be recommended by them.
- The project team should be aware that people across the country will interpret the standards differently.
- This is a repetition of an extensive process that was completed by CCJA.
- Should be careful to make the distinction between standards and procedures.
- Different models may be selected on the basis of the level of competence and ability of staff - Model A for some and Model B for others.
- Standards must also reflect and be compatible with the mission statements of provincial correctional services, if the contracting out of services is to be considered now or in the future.

- Attempts to develop workable conditional release supervision standards may promote professionalism and strengthen community corrections.

- Case Management Strategies must be considered brought in this exercise.

- How will this affect resources and the person year (PY) formula?

- Concern with how this may affect private agencies, e.g., not only telling them what they should do but how they should do it.

- The question of accountability should be clarified - can standards do this in audit and evaluation?

- There needs to be continuity from sentencing through post-release, and minimum standards of supervision which are appropriate to allow assessment and follow-up of individual needs via case plans.

- The development of standards should be guided by, but not driven by, the desire to accommodate provincial or private sector agencies.

- Standards should respect guidelines in CSC/NPB Administrative Agreement.

- Case planning is a major part of supervision and it should be guided by standards.

- The active supervision approach as set out in the Philosophy section is strongly supported. This attracts the best professionals while the converse encourages them to leave.

- The wider environmental context of Conditional Release Standards cannot be applied in one part of the federal correctional system exclusive of inter-related parts, e.g., standards will have little effect on successful integration if offender has suffered from prison experience which has increased his/her isolation from the community.

- Privatization of government correctional services is a danger as it can create financial dependency and impede criminal justice reform; it creates conflict in the community between registered charities and unions and encourages competition; it abdicates direct government responsibility for the administration of government legislated sanctions.

- The relationship between CSC and the contracting agencies remains misunderstood.

- No mention of accountability of CSC and the agency to the offender.

- There appears to be a drift away from minimum standards based on quantitative measurement to desirable or excellent standards based on qualitative measurements; this is dangerous. Support for minimum standards.

- The hard work the Project Team put into the Discussion Paper is recognized and the agency appreciates being able to participate in written response form and at a regional conference.

- The Project Team should not choose "social learning theory" over other modern systems of intervention.

- The development of standards should first be based on a good philosophical and theoretical base, from which would flow objectives and new standards or guidelines.

- Greater attention should be given when translating a text: translating the letter of the text does not always mean the message is the same.

- The upcoming automation of OMS (Offender Management System)should be considered in the development of standards.

- Ongoing research should be done to validate the working instruments and field procedures.

- There should be differentiation between supervision standards in CCC's/CRC's (Community Correctional Centres/Community Residential Facilities) and in the community per se.

- The standards should allow for regional and cultural differences.

- Why do the existing standards need to be revised?

COMMENTS ABOUT AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Audit against standards should be performed by an independent third party. This will set up an objective dialogue between CSC and other agencies.
- Audit against standards should be performed by CSC.
- Audit against standards should be performed by a bipartite or tripartite committee (CSC/contracting agency or CSC/province/contracting agency).
- Audit should include an "exit interview" with clients in order to assess their satisfaction with the service.
- An accreditation process for contracting agencies should be considered.
- Annual performance reviews between two contractors demands a two-way audit in relation to the contracted service.

ISSUE #1

The balance between quality supervision and the autonomy and independence of agencies.

- The National Parole Board has recently articulated its mission and in the interpretation of the mission, National Parole Board should be seen as a decision-making body or as a consumer of information; and by law, the Correctional Service of Canada is responsible for supervision - the difference between the two agencies is spelled out in the Statement of Understanding.

- Standards should have a clearly stated base requirement (e.g., in frequency of contact); but should allow some flexibility in how supervision should be done (e.g., in counselling).

- Provinces and private agencies may respond differently, e.g., in casework modalities or in issues of training.

- In contracting with agencies don't forget that "we're (CSC) buying a service" and should be able to define what we really want or what is essential.

- In assessing the quality of supervision it is essential to ensure that there is not undue risk - different standards will be needed for different individuals.

- Clear concise standards should not interfere with the autonomy of agencies - in fact standards that are not clear may interfere with their autonomy.

- The National Parole Board wishes to ensure that the offender can remain in the community as an undue risk until warrant expiry.

- The project team should adopt a set of standards developed by some other outside group, such as the CCJA (Canadian Criminal Justice Association).

- The standards must be developed primarily for the parole supervisor and not the agency.

- The uniqueness of the private sector has to be recognized otherwise we will be creating clones.

- Agencies already have their own standards - if those standards conflict with CSC's requirements, then CSC should not contract.
- It is impossible to develop a set of standards to please everybody.
- CCJA standards focus on goals and principles - each sector (private and public) can maintain their independence by developing their own policies and procedures to achieve those standards.
- There has to be uniformity of process but not program or activity.
- If we define the objective of supervision and there is agreement on this, then autonomy will take care of itself.
- The relationship between the public and private sector has to be defined - is it one of dependence or independence?
- Agencies who are not capable of meeting all the standards may provide service for a particular classification or category of offenders.
- Service delivery should not be compromised by the inability of an agency to meet standards.
- Procedural standards will threaten the autonomy of private agencies. Emphasis should be on qualitative standards that focus on accomplishment, rather than procedural standards stating how to accomplish a task. Perhaps the standard should read that agencies will have procedural standards of their own.
- It would be impossible for the Federal government to contract out services without ensuring that their standards are met as a minimum.
- Uniformity in standards can be done without decreasing the autonomy and independence of agencies.
- There must be a minimum number of standards anyway, if only to define how the public will be protected.
- There should be as few standards as possible.

- The standards should allow for the different "raison d'être" of the agencies: private services are there to help the offender, CSC is there to protect and control.

- Standards should not talk about a method of intervention nor tools that must be used.

- Agencies are looking forward to seeing how the project team will be able to maintain their autonomy and independence in the development of standards in the next phase.

- To accept federal money is to accept federal standards.

- Agencies must be willing to either adopt government standards or when considering contracting for parole supervision CSC should ensure that there are no significant discrepancies between the agency's philosophy and that of the Service and NPB.

ISSUE #2

Should the Ministry, contracting agencies and provinces agree to a single set of standards?

- o If standards are defined as essential, how would it be possible for others to use their own standards?
- o This issue is tied to issue #1 and should be discussed in the same context. It also links to issue #6, i.e., whether a level of discretion in the application of standards can be permitted.
- o It would be helpful to have one set to give agencies an idea of what CSC wants but allow the agency to augment them with their own.
- o It is not appropriate to ask private agencies or other agencies to abandon their own standards, although certain elements in CSC standards should be uniform to all supervising agencies.
- o Standards should be incorporated into a contract with room left for negotiation where the standards of both parties are widely apart.
- o It is not necessary to have agencies and provinces agree to a single set of standards.
- o Agree with the principle of universal application of standards for all NPB releases.
- o A good set of qualitative standards will allow room for healthy variations established by individual agencies.
- o It is essential to have the same standards for offenders being supervised by different agencies; especially for female offenders, there are wide variations in caseloads and service among various supervising agencies, and particularly between federal and provincial agencies.
- o "To ensure that contracting agencies internal standards and practices are consistent with and do not contradict those of the Ministry" would satisfy this issue - this would be more easily implemented than a "single set of Standards".
- o The standards must allow for regional and cultural differences.

ISSUE #3

Should there be special standards for special offender groups (Natives, women, offenders in rural areas)?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- The examples are limiting.

- What about violent offenders, hard core repeat offenders, mentally disordered, older, neurologically damaged, and sex offenders? There should perhaps be specific standards for these special groups too.

- Standards should state that offenders' special needs shall be identified and addressed through a case plan.

- "INTERVENTION STANDARDS" may be needed for special groups based on the differentiation of offenders. These might include statements concerning the continuity of programs, level of contact, skills required in supervision, etc. Programming should be aimed at dealing with behaviour.

COMMENTS FAVOURING SPECIAL STANDARDS

- There should be standards to ensure that special problem areas are dealt with.

- There should be standards of awareness, knowledge and experience to ensure the staff have the qualifications needed in working with Native offenders.

- Natives have been disadvantaged by over-generalization - standards are needed to ensure a basic level of knowledge, e.g., training issues.

- Standards should address the ability of workers to deal effectively in interpersonal relationships with Natives.

- There is no need for special standards for all special offender groups; however, there is a need for special standards to address the needs of the Native Offender and female offender, as they have particular needs.

MAYBE SPECIAL STANDARDS ARE NOT NECESSARY

- The application of Case Management Strategies ensures differentiation between offenders - this then becomes a casework issue rather than one addressed specifically by standards.
- A general standard such as "there will be continuity of programming in the community" allows for the extension of programs that may have been initiated in the institution - a certain level of discretion in the interpretation of what is needed should be permitted.
- How can "proper supervision" be defined in terms of differences between male and female clients?
- This may be an appropriate place to look at "guidelines" rather than standards.
- There should be no special standards beyond the minimum standards. Individuals should be dealt with according to their needs. These needs should be determined by the supervisor in consultation with the offender.
- Prefer Option 2A - special needs should be assessed in an individualized needs analysis and case plan. Standards apply to all cases with enough flexibility to accommodate individual needs.
- Prefer Option 2B - let the assessment of offender set standards required. Leave the "how" to the supervisor.
- We are supposed to be meeting Option 2B now, and we already face severe shortages of community services and financial resources.
- If special needs are to be addressed, the proper funding level will have to be provided. The current funding level does not reflect the required level of programming for special offender groups.
- An offender's needs change constantly; decisions about how to address them are best left to the parole officer.
- In isolated areas, there is a lack of facilities and transportation - special standards would only serve to reinforce the differences.

- Address this area by having standards that address quality issues.
- If you are meeting the needs of the offender, then you automatically deal with the special needs.
- This focusses on special provisions for offenders as opposed to special provisions for standards.
- People would feel more comfortable with Model "A" standard on this issue.
- Prefer Option 2C.
- Basic common sense and good professionalism are enough to meet special needs.

ISSUE #4

Should supervision standards set the "minimum" standards or "Standards of excellence"?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Parole officers' talents vary, as do the specialties at which they are "excellent".
- To a certain extent we have to identify minimum standards or minimum expectations as spelled out in the agreements.
- The new NPB decision policies are more precise about the basic requirements, e.g., expectation that we address the offender's problems.
- The standards are not intended to establish the "ideal", only what is "essential".
- It does not seem enough to just set out the minimum.
- What is "desirable" should be amalgamated into the minimum.
- Prefer Option 3C - modification of standards should be expressed as goals within standards. Only where "absolutely necessary" should minimum standards be included.
- We should avoid the use of the words minimum or maximum.
- We require minimum standards and also standards of excellence.
- Standards should be set at a certain level (one that involves a quality service) but can be deviated from with a National explanation - should be a clear process to deviate from the standard.
- Standards should be set high so that parole officers will be encouraged to be creative.
- The size of caseloads has not been addressed - there should be a standard to address this issue.
- Instead of "minimum" standards, standards could be identified as either basic, essential or desirable.

- Refer to "optimum standards" rather than minimum or ideal standards.
- Option 3C - to the base of mandatory standards you could add a 2nd set of "ideal standards".
- There are certain essential requirements that are statutory, e.g., suspension interviews, timely reports; we must have minimum standards to address these.
- Minimum standards tend to become maximums.
- Minimum standards can become restrictive.
- Desirable standards (those go beyond minimum) can become negotiated at contract time - not because of paranoia but more of a resourcing question.
- Minimum standards should be set with the onus placed on the agency to determine how it will meet and/or exceed the standard.
- Standards should enable the parole officer to understand what is minimal, and give direction on how to exceed the minimum.
- CSC should not attempt alone to articulate objectives, ideals and principles as these could emphasize risk-oriented surveillance and control standards at the expense of needs of the offender.
- Basic values must be defined first.
- CSC would have difficulty implementing a system to assess qualitative excellence.
- "Excellence" does not mean the same thing in French as in English. In French, it contains the idea of something unreachable, whereas in English, excellence is the behaviour of the best.
- Professionals are not stimulated by standards; professionals need to identify expectations and results.

THE QUESTION OF RESOURCES

- Will the resources be sufficient to do the job?
- If the desired effects are specified in the standards, the resource base must be provided.
- Case Management Strategies offer a mechanism to limit the amount of time that should be spent with certain offenders, i.e., limit setters.

  1) that which is needed to meet statutory requirements;
  2) that which is needed to meet the objectives set out in our Mission Statements;
  3) statements of ideal which may not be possible given resource levels provided.

- That which can be realistically achieved should serve as a guide.
- These standards should be set within a realistic context of current and future restraints. Restraint should be seen as a "given" rather than a passing phenomenon.
- Resources have to be provided to enable agencies to meet the standards.

ISSUE #5

How to articulate the quality or content of supervision.

- Difficult to define, but necessary in order to move us away from the procedural/quantity control, and back to a casework orientation.
- Quality could be defined as performing to the "best of our ability" which would have to be measured by auditing the standards.
- Option 4C seems quite adequate in articulating what you're trying to achieve.
- Quality is not static, it reflects a dynamic situation such as the quality of interaction between the offender and supervisor.
- Quality supervision should include evidence of progress; this could be measured with a periodic needs analysis.
- There should be emphasis on the quality of case planning.
- You cannot use quality because it cannot be defined without making it too difficult to audit.
- How do you measure quality standards?
- The audit process should involve an outside auditing procedure, i.e., the auditor should be a neutral person not involved with the monetary aspect of the contract.
- The standards should not be geared towards audits but towards standards of excellence.
- Standards should not state how to achieve quality supervision. Quality standards should focus on the accomplishment, the results expected by the agency, in consultation with the offender.
- The only real measure of good supervision is results - the offender does not return to destructive situations, makes progress towards being a productive citizen.
- Prefer Option 4C, but the "how" should not become too directive.

- Operational requirements or procedures should not be covered by standards.

- Prefer Option 4B, which allows more autonomy on how certain standards are implemented.

- Autonomy should be given to the manager in order to preserve professionalism.

- Prefer a middle ground between 4C and 4B. Standards should suggest as opposed to specifying certain elements.

- The best approach is to ensure those things which lead to good supervision (proper staff selection, good training, adequate salary levels), and not try to define supervision itself.

- Option 4C assumes supervisors don't know what is involved in "good supervision".

- Standards must ensure that quality, and the processes which ensure quality, are addressed. The quality of supervision is tied to sound needs analysis, client involvement/commitment to the case plan, case conference output analysis, action taken, outcomes of supervisor/offender contacts.

- Option 4C allows for sufficient autonomy while still providing the community with predictable mechanisms for accountability.

- With Option 4C prefer to see the word "shall" used rather than "should" when a standard details the obligations of the department in assisting the parole supervision.

- Don't develop standards that blame the officer for offender's behaviour. There should be an opportunity to make honest mistakes.

- Agencies and officers need to be accountable and justify their decisions.

- Standards should be derived from the mission, then the principles, then the objectives. Such a process should promote the quality of supervision.

ISSUE #6"

Exceptions to Standards

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- o If a standard is an essential requirement, how can flexibility be permitted?
- o The Parole Board should be required to decide on exceptions to a standard.
- o If supervision standards cannot be met, the releasing authority should be notified prior to the release decision; whether or not the standards can be met should be decided at the time the release decision is made.
- o There is a need for some standards that are individualized.
- o Recognition of special situations should be built into the standards. There are occasions where you want to make an exception.
- o Standards should be written in a clear and flexible enough way that exceptions are not necessary.
- o The more standards you have, greater discretion is needed.
- o Within each standard certain circumstances should permit some variation or deviation.
- o If a standard is an essential requirement, how can flexibility be permitted? You either have a standard or you don't have one.
- o There is a dichotomy here - a standard may be unreasonable in terms of the resource base and yet can be seen as essential for the protection of society it then becomes a matter of weighing the question of "risk".
- o Not all standards are equal, and the means to vary from them could also vary.
- o No discretion should be permitted with special NPB conditions.
- o Discretion should continue to be permitted with special NPB conditions.

- Agencies under contract should have no override authority.
- If there is too much discretion being applied, then the standards are probably too restrictive.

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT FOR DISCRETION

- It should be possible to make an exception to a standard and then inform the Board later.
- Certain exceptions to standards need to be delegated, at least to the area manager or section supervisor.
- Parole officers who are professional and competent should be given the authority to make exceptions.
- In the agreement with the Board some discretion should be permitted, e.g., the Board should be notified of a significant change in supervision but prior approval should not be needed.
- The Board should only be involved when a specific decision is required.
- Prefer Option 5A - parole officers need this discretion in order to function.
- Prefer Option 5C - there is a need for distinction between standards and requirements or authority for exceptions.
- Prefer Option 5D, which provides some flexibility after the initial period of intensive supervision.
- The person authorizing exceptions should be held accountable.
- Prefer Option 5C, with the exception of special conditions set by NPB.
- Exceptions are needed for remote areas.
- Major deviations submitted to N.P.B. for review or approval. Minor variations at discretion of supervisor.
- Some discretion on special conditions should be permitted, especially for cases that have performed satisfactorily for several months (48 hours before suspending is suggested).

- Maximum opportunity for the parole officer equivalent in the private agency to use discretion. Failing this use of discretion, his/her supervisor should have discretion and CSC should be consulted.

- The parole officer should have a lot of discretionary authority in consultation with his supervisor.

- If parole plans need to be varied and permission required from NPB, the contracting agency should have a major say in recommendations to the Board and be allowed to recommend amendments to the terms and conditions of the NPB plan.

- Consistency will be better maintained if all exceptions are referred to NPB for at least the first six months.

- In keeping with the CSC's and NPB's different roles, waivers for supervision standards should be handled within CSC and waivers pertaining to release conditions or obligations of the offender should continue to be handled by the NPB.

COMMENTS CONCERNING CURRENT PRACTICE

- In agreements with the Board there are variations in the interpretation and practice.

- Variations in regional agreements do not permit a consistent level of practice across the country.

ISSUE #7

How should the standards address frequency of contact?

- The current minimum standards for frequency of contact are based on a Ministerial directive - can they be changed without Ministerial approval?
- Frequency of contact standards are basic and will have to be maintained.
- Frequency of contact standards are completely inconsistent with the philosophy of professionalism in supervision.
- Even if an offender is seen to be a low risk and has low needs he still has to be seen occasionally.
- The perception of the public has to be taken into consideration, i.e., a certain level of contact with all offenders must be maintained.
- The frequency of contact should be based on the needs of the offender.
- An offender's needs and risk vary over time, and thus the parole officer requires lots of flexibility to determine frequency of contact.
- The standards should allow for some flexibility in this area and be based on categories of offenders.
- The parole officer and his supervisor should decide how often the person should be seen.
- More discretion should be given in terms of which category and when the individual should be put into that category.
- Case Management Strategies and Risk Prediction Scales should be used to determine which category the individual is in - the category would then indicate the frequency of contact. If we have these tools then we must rely on them.
- Frequency of contact standards should be maintained as a basic minimum - feel Options 6A2 and 6A3 are both workable.
- Upon release, contact should be at least weekly in all cases - this would allow parole officer to get to know the offender and consult with those who are involved.

- District Directors, Area Managers, Section Supervisors and Superintendents should have the authority to increase frequency of contact standards, if they have a rationale.

- Agree with Option 6A2, but imposing rigid FOC (Frequency of Contact) standards for the first 6 to 12 months may have little value.

- Should only have FOC standards for the initial period following release; after that, leave it to the parole officer.

- Must not forget that frequency of contact is related to caseload size.

- After the first or second contact with the offender, the parole officer should give a report on the adequacy of the FOC standard in this case. The officer's exercise of judgment should permit modifications, but in line with general standards and based on offender performances.

- Prefer 6A2 but would need further consultation regarding a "classification tool".

- 6A2 suggests standards be uniform with limited potential for misinterpretation.

- If you have a needs/risk scale and case plan FOC standards are not needed.

- Assessment of risk and needs should be done by the parole officer with maximum input from the client to allow client legitimate ownership of his/her plan.

- A standard or F.O.C. should take into account regional particularities: urban, rural, cultural, etc.

ISSUE #8

What should standards say about collateral contacts and home and community visits?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- There should not be a standard which specifies the amount of contact in the community.
- It would be preferable merely to state in standards the objective which community contacts are directed towards.
- Community contacts are essential in order to get a clear assessment of the offender's home environment.
- The importance of community visits is highly over-rated - the quality of the contact whether it be at home or in the office should be emphasized.
- The dual role of supervision, i.e., control (surveillance and security) vs assistance (counselling, referrals, treatment), must be recognized in determining appropriate standards for contact in the community.
- A general guideline should be enough, stating that as many family visits as possible should be conducted.
- Making collateral/community contacts a guideline or "desirable" will not work because some parole officers do not do it all.
- The degree of community contact required should be decided by Area Managers, Section Supervisors and Superintendents.
- Standards should require documentation of reasons why visits in the community have not occurred.
- There must be an element of surprise in community contacts, and this makes it difficult to ensure that such contacts will occur at a specified frequency.
- Social contact with the offender is important - to develop relationship as both a friend and supervisor.

- The assessment of risk and needs should determine the extent to which the community situation needs to be checked out. Contacts should be made in the context of a plan of care.

- Address the question of whether collateral contacts contribute to the assessment of the case ???

- Contact should be maintained more frequently in the community than in the office.

- Additional duties imposed in the past few years make it impossible to fulfill the requirement for community contacts.

- Are there Privacy Act concerns raised by some community contacts? Is the offender's consent needed for the parole officer to disclose certain information about him to third parties, or is this assumed by his acceptance of a conditional release?

- Definition and degree of collateral contacts should be established.

- It would be sufficient to state that community contacts are preferred to office contacts. However, ratios are unnecessary to mention because that would negate a differential treatment approach.

STANDARDS FOR COLLATERAL CONTACT ARE NEEDED

- Suggest "low risk" offenders would require minimum community based contacts of 25% and "high risk" require current minimum of 60%.

- For visits to dangerous offenders in the home environment, two staff should go or at least one staff and one volunteer.

- These should definitely be written in; they are essential.

- This goes beyond counselling - parole officer must know what is going on in offender's life.

- Should visit the offender's home when he is not there and speak to his wife or family members on a confidential basis.

- How else can the parole officer assess problems in offender's relationship, e.g., child abuse, wife battering, etc.

NO SPECIAL STANDARDS ARE NEEDED

- If all the elements of good supervision are written in standards, it should not be necessary to specify the number of collateral contacts.
- No need if CMS is driving the case, i.e., will be different scenarios for different types of offenders.
- Should not have to specify what percentage of time should be spent in the community.
- Undue specification could endanger parole officers in some situations.

ISSUE #9

How should the standards address the gathering and sharing of information?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Reference was made to Section 17 of the Parole Regulations regarding the sharing of information with offenders.
- Parole officers are not qualified to provide the "gist" of psychological and psychiatric reports.
- There are still serious difficulties with getting psychiatric and medical reports - this problem must be solved.
- Reference to the parallel situation in the Canadian Medical Association concerning AIDS, i.e., in life threatening situations does the potential victim have the "right to know".
- The NPB Policy and Procedures Manual has 35 pages on the use and disclosure of information: a complex issue.
- In CCC's, information should also be shared with the Corps of Commissionaires.
- In the development of standards, we should be very specific in relation to the sharing of information.
- Privacy Act and the interpretation of "consistent use" should be considered.
- There is confusion in the field about the application of the criteria which permit the disclosure of personal information.
- Are the recommendations of the Ruygrok enquiry concerning the sharing of information being taken into consideration?
- Existing legislation must be considered.
- Code of ethics for staff in agencies relates to question of confidentiality.
- Having the "gist" of reports is not enough.

- Have to recognize the conflict among principles, e.g., individual's right to privacy, public's right to know, protection of society, protection of sources of information, the need to know by victims and collaterals.

- Withholding any information from parole supervisors should be the exception rather than the rule.

- Need to be sensitive to the "where" and "who" in any standard to ensure the least amount of overt interference in parolee's community adjustment.

- The gathering and sharing of information is critical but it is beyond the scope of supervision standards.

- Some want the sharing of all information while others want the sharing of only the pertinent information.

SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH AGENCIES

- Indirect agencies should be provided with enough information in order that they can do a quality job. This observation was made by many participants, who felt that it should be written in the form of a general standard to be applied by all.

- Some concern was expressed at how this would be controlled and whether agencies would be seen as a federal information bank.

- Agencies who accept supervision must have all the information if they are held accountable.

- Agencies have access to CSC file now but procedure of reviewing files in CSC offices creates additional work.

- There should be "guidelines" on disclosure.

- "Informed consent" is needed for psychological and psychiatric reports.

- Consent should not be needed for contracting agencies.

- Question of "trust" - police will not share information unless they trust the agency (trust is hard to reflect in a standard).

- Could use dummy files in agencies and return to CSC after W.E.D. (Warrant Expiry Date) - would then be a link-bank.

- o Parole offices (agency and CSC) should have all necessary information before they have to deal with an offender.
- o Standard could really help agencies who are concerned with obtaining "hard information".
- o Agencies should be required to develop procedures concerning confidentiality and sharing of information before contracting with CSC.
- o Agencies should have the same information as CSC if they are to do the same job.
- o Sharing information is a basic requirement to accomplish the agreed upon contract; the sharing of information should be described in a procedure and not in a standard.
- o Agencies should have full access, including the medical file.
- o If agency staff cannot be trusted with sensitive information, then agency staff cannot be expected to perform up to the standards which exist now or in the future.
- o No reason why all information shouldn't be shared with agencies as long as proper hiring standards apply (i.e., no unpardoned ex-offenders or offenders under sentence should be allowed to work directly with parolees).

<u>NEED FOR SAFEGUARDS - POLICE INFORMATION</u>

- o Police will not share sensitive information - special concern with third party consent - CSC also use C.I.R. (Confidential Information Report) format.
- o The amount of police information which is truly sensitive is very small.
- o Should discuss these issues at the National Joint Committee of Chiefs of Police and Federal Correctional Services.
- o Police have concern about the sharing of "intelligence" (agreement is needed on this, with or without the standards).
- o This may be an issue of credibility, trust and mutual respect - between agencies, police and CSC.

- The question of liability if full disclosure doesn't take place.
- This is still a gray area subject to various interpretations.

ISSUE #10

How should the standards address 24-hour availability of supervision?

GENERAL COMMENTS

- CSC and all agencies providing supervision should have 24-hour supervision services available.
- Clients, police and collateral contacts must be able to contact a responsible person.
- The difference between access to a duty officer and access to the parole officer actually responsible for the case was debated - it was suggested that in large urban centres it would not be reasonable to expect parole officers to give out their home phone numbers.
- It used to be that clients and police had home phone numbers for every parole officer.
- The availability of a large range of outside emergency services in urban areas was suggested as an alternative.
- Yes, acknowledge the need for 24-hour availability in standards, but do not specify how it should be done. Should be options on how it is to be implemented.
- Question whether duty officer can always assess accurately whether the parole officer should be contacted.
- Availability only for crisis situations, not for routine casework.
- Should be available to provide control, when individuals need to be controlled.
- If private agencies don't have the capacity or necessary equipment, CSC snould provide backup or access to their equipment. Extra funding would be needed in some situations.
- General consensus that this is needed in Atlantic Region.
- The wording of this standard is important, i.e., what is meant by supervision "services".

- A lot of problems could be avoided if 24-hour service was really provided, not just ability to suspend.
- This may be an issue of funding for the agencies if no increase in rates is provided.
- Should be a discretionary standard - i.e., only if there is a substantial demand in any given location.
- NPB should also have 24-hour availability.
- Personal alarms should be available to all parole supervisors whether or not they do shift work.
- The executive director or parole program or the parole program supervisor of the contracting agency should be available for after-hour consultation by the agency parole officer. If this is not possible, the CSC duty officer should take no action on an agency case unless every attempt has been made to consult with the agency.
- This is not an issue for standards development and should be left to policy and operational procedures.
- The Standard need only state the fact of 24-hour availability. Certain procedural matters are limited to contract terms and there may be practical restrictions from region to region.
- There should be a study done on the use made of the services presently available, to determine the actual need.
- Provincial corrections have only answering services.

ISSUE #11

How should the standards address police liaison?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Standards should define what is meant by proper police liaison.
- Liaison with the police should be encouraged in all stages, i.e., at the time of sentence, when release is considered, at the time of release, when there are violations or suspensions.
- All agencies providing supervision should have a "strategy for liaison" (concern was expressed that in some areas police have expressed a lack of confidence in private agencies).
- Liaison with police is essential - may be different in large urban areas with liaison officers.
- The standards should require high-level established police liaison in large cities.
- Police reporting by parolees is not needed - should be discontinued because it creates unnecessary anxiety.
- Emphasis on importance of police reports, especially information about the offence is needed to do proper forensic assessment.
- The value of criminal justice workshops should be set down in standards - these should include Crown prosecutors.
- Having a regular contact person can help to deal with issue of trust.
- Police should not have to be informed of every breach, especially when there is no police action being requested.
- Reference to the Handbook for Police Officers.
- Relationships cannot be standardized - there should be some definitions in terms of how we work together.
- Private agencies could have a policeman on their Board.

- Standards should not specify requirements for proper police liaison - general and basic elements of police liaison will vary from one jurisdiction to the next.

- Requires working at these relationships; essential in order to encourage police to give us important information about offenders.

- Those involved in police liaison must be well trained; if not, they can be more harmful than helpful.

- Special police liaison officers are not required; watch commanders can fulfill this role.

- Established liaison with mental health, employment and immigration officials is just as important as police liaison.

- Police should be informed of breaches of conditions and the official action resulting from them, even if it is only to maintain the credibility of the supervisory agency in the police's eyes.

- Standards on police liaison should include statements of what information will be shared between the parties and what information will be acted upon.

- The ongoing liaison between agencies and police may not include sensitive information (which would go through CSC) but more general issues such as neighbourhood impact, education and crisis intervention.

- Cooperation between the police and parole officers should be implicit but defined.

- If a new offence has been committed, the police should be informed.

ISSUE #12

What standards should govern the use of volunteers in supervision?

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Some Districts already have standing orders which clarify the position of volunteers. The role of volunteers should be included in Correctional Officer training.
- The term "Volunteer" should be better defined.
- With increased privatization the use of volunteers by CSC has declined.
- A lot of time and energy must be expended to maintain a good volunteer program.
- CSC should have a clear policy on volunteers before we can talk of a standard.
- Increased use of volunteers should be encouraged with emphasis on a broader use of volunteers in agency work.
- Volunteers can be used for UTA's (Unescorted Temporary Absence) (sponsors) but not for ETA's (Escorted Temporary Absence).
- The standards should articulate the "role" volunteers play but not try to specify their selection, recruitment and training.
- Volunteers form the board of private sector agencies and therefore determine policies, e.g., if the agency should be involved in parole supervision or not.
- Volunteers of a private agency should be trained by that agency according to the agency's standards.

SUPPORT FOR LIMITED USE OF VOLUNTEERS

- Volunteers should never be given total responsibility for a case - although they could be involved as a member of a supervising team.
- Standards must define how far the responsibilities of volunteers can go.

- Standards should require agencies to establish their own policies regarding volunteers' role, experience, education, etc.
- Standards should state that the agency shall encourage volunteer programs.
- There are legal implications, i.e., can volunteers become supervisors or should they only be assistants?
- Volunteers are important but should not be actual supervisors. Should be used as adjunctive helpers.
- Volunteer supervisors may be needed in exceptional circumstances, e.g., rural, outlying areas.
- Volunteers can be especially useful with multiple-problem offenders, support groups, and complementary activities.
- The same rules should apply as with staff, i.e., they should be carefully screened and given proper training.
- Volunteers can assist agencies in areas other than parole supervision. Not to make client contacts as a substitute for parole officer.
- Volunteers should not be used in high risk cases unless they are trained professionals.
- There should be careful screening of volunteers.
- Volunteers shuld have the same benchmarks applied to them as paid workers.
- Volunteers should not be involved in direct supervision.
- If there is to be standards on volunteers in supervision, it should allow for regional differences; some regions have a long history of working with volunteers whereas other regions have little to no experience with volunteers in the area of supervision.
- Vounteers should be teamed with clients according to their life experiences.
- The parole officer is ultimately responsible for the actions of the volunteer.

- We should not rely on volunteers simply for "cheap labour".
- Training should be required in standards for volunteers; however, such training should be left to the after-care agency.
- Lengthy training periods for volunteers could cause a loss of candidates due to time requirements.

SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTEERS AS SUPERVISORS

- Volunteers working under the "guidance and direction of a parole supervisor" can take over full responsibility of a case.
- The key issue is training - if volunteers are adequately trained they can be very useful with certain cases, e.g., high needs.
- Standards for volunteers need not be specified since all standards apply to all supervision; it is the responsibility of agencies utilizing volunteers to ensure that volunteers meet all standards.

ISSUE #13

What should standards say about the selection and training of supervisors?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Yearly training should be mandatory.
- There is a need for further training of parole officers.
- Refresher training for those who don't keep up to date is essential.
- Training should include cultural awareness, professional sensitivity/awareness.
- As professionals, parole officers and their supervisors have a responsibility to seek to maintain a level of knowledge and skills.
- The agencies should have the discretion to define the essential skills needed and to set their own standards for selecting and training of their staff. Rigid standards for staff qualifications should not be applied unless there is documented evidence that certain qualifications provide desirable results.
- There should be a responsibility for CSC to offer some training to agencies.
- Training programs should be jointly developed and delivered by government and private agencies.
- There should be stringent selection to ensure essential skills and abilities are assessed, e.g., general education, degree, related experience, personal suitability. Standardized competency testing could be considered.
- Supervising agencies should meet the same standard as CSC.
- Any individual with delegated signing authority should be trained.
- Offenders have the right to quality supervision, and this necessitates parole officers who have received proper induction training and annual re-training and/or development opportunities.

- o A university degree in human sciences or experience in the field of counselling should be required.
- o The standard should take into account a basic induction level - minimum educational requirements and the classification of parole officers into professional categories.
- o Selection standard should require post-secondary education or related experience, plus passing an examination following induction training, and a probationary period.
- o Prefer Canadian Criminal Justice Association (CCJA) standard.
- o Case Management Strategies training by CSC with private agency personnel should continue.
- o Don't expect too much from the universities - there are no practical skills taught at undergraduate level.

STANDARDS SHOULD NOT SPECIFY SELECTION AND TRAINING

- o This is an organizational, personnel issue - should not be included in supervision standards. Should be part of Agency's Policy and Procedures Manual.
- o Concern with the "intrusiveness" in terms of the private sector.
- o Many private agencies have staff with university degrees - but they don't get paid as well as CSC.
- o The standards should specify the expected level of service delivery in contracts, not the qualifications of staff. Their policies should be clearly articulated.
- o Could be a question of resources, if minimum qualifications of staff are specified. Many provincial and private agencies cannot meet stringent training standards.
- o CSC should set the standard for training their own staff and then assess the ability of each potential contracting agency against that standard. Where in CSC's opinion, the agency staff require increased training to meet the standard, CSC should provide the training which would allow the agency to meet the requirements of the contract.

CONCERN WITH CURRENT SITUATION IN CSC

- At a minimum, a university degree should be required for parole officer positions.
- This could become a standard for CSC and a guideline for the agencies.
- Professional development is very important.
- An induction training program should be established - everyone should be brought up to a certain level.
- A university degree guarantees a certain starting level, i.e., how to process information, how to use information effectively.
- Current one-year probation period is not enough - pass/fail system does not allow for adequate exploration of suitability.
- Suitability for work should be assessed in an intensive training environment.
- Annual performance appraisal should be used to identify appropriate training.
- The minimum hours required for training should not be taken up by administrative issues and organizational initiatives like Case Management Strategies. The time should be spent in real professional development.
- Should consider more open-ended pay scales that recognize excellence and experience.
- Ministry selection standards are needed as a screening mechanism, e.g., 250 persons applied for one position.
- Standards should address competence, e.g., ability to look at global issue, communicate on paper, assist clients in problem-solving, integrate life experiences, etc.
- The use of post-institutional CX (Correctional Officer) level personnel employed in CSC (Parole) brings an emphasis on surveillance and control to conditional release supervision.

ISSUE #14

How should standards address the parole officer's brokerage role?

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Standards should be written to encourage the use of appropriate resources.
- Perhaps there should be a standard such as "10% of CSC's budget should be spent on community services".
- Districts should have specialists with expertise in resource development. Resource inventories should be maintained.
- Standards should say something about the obligation to use community resources.
- General needs of offenders should be identified by agencies and resources should be provided or developed. Agencies who are involved in supervision should also be responsible for service delivery for their client group (i.e., "the Resource Provision Model").
- Aggregate information about community needs and services is an essential organizational requirement.
- There should only be one level of brokerage - clients should not be referred from one agency to another in a search for appropriate services.
- Parole officers should follow up on each referral to ensure that adequate services have been provided.
- Brokerage idea is changing - with CMS we're getting back to casework.
- There is a change of focus and parole officers are making sure that the proper links are made.
- There are shrinking resources in the social envelope.
- We're paying more attention to the nature of the problem and using resources more intelligently.
- Feedback after referral is important.

- Time is a factor - Parole Officers are spending more time in referrals and followup.
- The role of Parole Officers in community resource development should be reemphasized.
- A standard in this area might help in the area of resources, i.e., it would presume that there would be enough money available to support the standard.
- In some communities where there is a waiting list to have a parolee seen by another agency, the parole officer must use his/her own expertise in managing.
- The NPB should be made aware at the time of a community assessment that certain community resources, e.g., alcohol recovery homes, have a waiting list and the release into the community should be made at the appropriate time.
- Standard should require that supervisor seek out and make effective use of community resources, facilitate the development of resources, and identify resources which should be evaluated for effectiveness. These are essential and central to the duties of the job.

STANDARD FOR BROKERAGE NOT NEEDED

- It should not be necessary to have this as a standard - it should be understood as part of good supervision.
- Brokerage is more in the realm of procedure, and should not be addressed in standards.
- Parole Officers should be aware of resources but not involved in identification and evaluation.
- If standards specify brokerage, they should also specify all other roles of a parole officer.
- The brokerage function is far more difficult to implement in rural areas.
- Brokerage is not necessarily carried out by each parole officer, but may be a function of the office as a whole, or the region.
- Brokerage can lead to fragmentation in service delivery and delays in providing needed support.

ISSUE #15

What should standards say about case conferencing and quarterly reports?

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Standards may be overkill in this case. We can't legislate good supervision practices.
- Generally in favour of case conferencing - can be a learning tool.
- The term Quarterly Reports should be dropped.
- Some form of regular record should be kept on each case.
- Standards should require supervisory staff to be available to parole officers and aware generally of each clients progress. Team supervision could be another alternative.
- The frequency of reports/case conferences should be based on stages of release.

COMMENTS RE CASE CONFERENCES

- There should be regular case conferences between a parole officer and his/her supervisor. Some recommend on a weekly basis.
- Case conferences should be oriented towards a pro-active preventative approach. This can provide for prompt identification of problems and for creativity in service delivery.
- In the search for quality in supervision, case conferences are essential.
- There should be a written record of all case conferences.
- Log books should suffice as a record of cases.
- Regular case conferences are a good idea - special incidents could be avoided if inexperienced parole officers were discussing their cases with a supervisor.
- An alternative to case conferences would be close supervision of Parole Officers in how to manage a case.

- With Case Management Strategies, case conference done in a formalized manner becomes a major quality control mechanism.
- The results of case progress reviews could be the basis of a report replacing the Quarterly Report, or could replace all or some Quarterly Reports.
- The frequency and timing of case conferences shoulds be determined by the needs and risk of the individual case. In some cases "you must", in others "you may".
- Case conferences should occur once a month.
- Case conferences should occur once every six months.
- Case conferencing is a crucial element for dynamic security in CCCs.
- Case conferences are important. The officer needs to get the supervisor's ideas before the case is in crisis.
- It is difficult, if not impossible, to case conference when the caseload is anywhere from 120 to 250 cases.
- Case conferences should only be called at the supervisor's discretion. Standards might only be needed for new workers during their probationary period.
- We should try team case conferencing. This would stimulate new ideas, allow a fresh perspective, keep an alternate worker up-to-date on difficult cases.
- Should have standards for case conference content but the parole officer should have discretion to call the conference.

COMMENTS RE QUARTERLY REPORTS

- Quarterly reports should be maintained - when cases must be reviewed for various reasons, having only activity records is not sufficient.
- Quarterly reports are more useful than case conferences.
- Quarterly reports can also be used to appraise those who are writing the reports, i.e., in assessing the quality of their work.

- Maybe the format of quarterly reports could be changed to make it as easy as possible.
- Summary reports from Case Management Strategies could replace the Quarterly Report.
- Quarterly reports are important for cases that go sour, to document the process and content of the supervision, to permit regular audit, and to give the officer a chance to step back from the case and look at it afresh.
- Quarterly Reports are not always read (or read carefully) before they are signed off.
- After the initial report, Quarterly Reports should only have to deal with information which is new since the last report.
- The private sector should be able to communicate directly with NPB.
- The status of a case should be documented at least two to three times per year.

ISSUE #16

What should standards say about criteria for suspension of conditional release?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Reference to the current NPB Decision Policies and the development of Chapter III - "Post-Release Decision Policies".
- NPB is somewhat concerned with the amount of litigation concerning the last two criteria in the Parole Act.
- The number of people with delegated authority has grown very large.
- The private sector does not want delegated authority (Atlantic Region).
- Private Agencies should not be permitted to exercise suspension power.
- We need more clear cut standards on suspension - we shouldn't suspend simply because an individual has been charged.
- On special conditions - have some discretion - if we don't suspend we must advise NPB immediately.
- If criteria for suspension are set in standards, there is a danger that the post-suspension hearing could concentrate more on whether the criteria were met than the behaviour of the parolee. The current practice is good.
- A large community agency feels that agencies that supervise should have delegated authority.
- An ad hoc community advisory committee could help the parole officer decide whether to suspend.
- No changes are needed to current suspension policy.
- Criteria to suspend must leave the discretion with the officer concerning particularly dangerous offenders.
- Major steps to be considered before taking action should be specified in standards.
- Suspension should be a last resort after other options have failed.

- Standards should address who can and cannot be delegated the authority to suspend, and should specify the criteria for withdrawal of this authority.
- Standard should require more consultation with NPB.
- This issue should be addressed in guidelines, not standards.
- Criteria are required as to how fast CSC should respond when asked by an agency to issue a suspension warrant.
- More flexibility should be built into the standards as to suspension as a result of violation of a special condition.
- Delegation must remain restricted to the supervisory level or those with selected experience.
- Rigid standards for suspension would not be able to replace the responsible assessment process that must take place prior to a suspension decision.
- Significant delays are caused by non-delegation of suspension authority to contracting agencies. Standards should allow for maximum flexibility in carrying out supervision, while maintaining a clearly articulated, stringent policy on when suspension must occur.
- Present criteria, Commissioner's Directive 780 and in the Parole Act appear suitable but there should be written guidelines and examples.
- Training of individuals who have delegation by the NPB on the use of criteria for suspension.

OTHER ISSUES

- Some concern with Section 19 of Parole Act - may need expanded delegation in some areas, e.g., New Brunswick.
- Section 19 causes difficulties concerning jurisdiction if individual is suspended in one area and picked up in another - Police are being asked to provide escorts to return offenders.
- Conflict of Interest.
- Rights of clients and staff.
- Rights of legal representation for supervisors.
- Ethics.
- Caseload size and resource levels (a formula).
- Inmates should be identified early on in the process to those agencies which will eventually be doing the supervision.
- "Buddy systems" for supervision - primary caseworker and alternate who keeps up-to-date, fills in during absences, participates in case conferences.
- Too many changes in supervision which seem to be dictated by the legal profession - project team should have legal consultation.
- Should be looking at current practices and base standards on what we think will be happening.
- The consultation period in the next phase of the project should be lengthened.
- The text should be of equal quality in both official languages.

4. INTERVIEWS OF PAROLEES AND INMATES

Eighteen conditionally released male inmates were interviewed in the Ontario Region during the week of February 22 - 26, 1988. Due to restrictions of time, it was not possible to interview in other regions and of the 18 interviews, all were released from federal institutions (four from outside the Ontario Region) and fourteen of the eighteen were on day parole living at a CSC CCC (Community Correctional Centre) or Community Residential Facility. Of the remaining four releases, two were on mandatory supervision with the stipulation by the NPB that they reside at the CCC or CRF, while two were on full parole and living on their own in the community.

The majority had experienced some time on supervision previously in the criminal justice system, i.e., on probation as a young offender under the old Juvenile Delinquents Act, on probation or provincial parole as an adult or previous experience on day parole, mandatory supervision or full parole either during the present sentence or for previous convictions. Due to the small sample, the Project Team would not suggest that the responses are representative of inmates on conditional release but the Team did feel, as did a number of agencies who made responses to the Discussion Paper, that offenders should be consulted as "consumers" of present standards or methods of supervision (in this sample all were supervised by CSC parole officers). In a number of responses, the parolee talked about previous supervision experiences.

In the introductory portion of the interview, the respondent was given a background to the supervision standards project and was told that the interviewers were interested in his opinions on certain areas of supervision. At the same time, it was explained that we were not doing an investigation of him or of his supervisor. The interviewer also advised that he had not read the CSC Case Management File prior to the interview and therefore had no knowledge of the type of release except to assume that most of those interviewed at the CRF/CCC were on day parole. The parolees, if they indicated a previous experience in supervision, were encouraged to talk about it and compare those experiences with their present supervision. Of the eighteen men, the shortest experience under present supervision was one week, while the longest period was two years.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM INTERVIEWS WITH PAROLEES

1. **Do you think that your parole officer has enough authority to make changes in the conditions and requirements of the supervision order under which you are released?**

Responses:

- yes, but this matter has never been raised
- special condition: to abstain from intoxicants is a Board condition and really doesn't help me
- no, (individual in residential facility on one-shot mandatory supervision - passes for week-end leave had to be granted by NPB)
- no, (individual stated he was not allowed to leave his area to visit his wife because of objections of police department)
- any changes in conditions of certificate of parole should be approved by the Parole Board first as they released me
- the Area Manager or the Superintendent of the CCC should make final decision
- the NPB should have only one or two general conditions in a standard certificate; other conditions should be set by parole officer who knows your case best

2. **How often do you see your parole officer?**

Responses:

- once a month
- twice in the past five months
- every two weeks
- once a week
- every day (in CCC)

3(a) **Where do you usually meet your parole officer?**

Responses:

- usually meet in his office
- varies - at boarding house, parole office or restaurant
- always meet in parole office by previous appointment
- sometimes meet at halfway house during the times I am in the addiction program; other times he visits me in my home
- we meet at her parole office and also at a restaurant in a plaza. I board with a family who doesn't know I'm on parole

3(b) **Does it matter whether you meet in the office or your home or in a public place?**

Responses:

- no difference whether we meet in the office or home
- would not want interviews in my home because this would violate my privacy
- unannounced (by parole officer) home visits would be going behind my back
- meet at the halfway house for the most part
- usually at the CSC office "There are too many ears at the halfway house"
- the parole officer should visit the parolee at his home unexpectedly because if he didn't the parolee could be "boozing it up"
- now at the halfway house; when I get full parole, he will probably visit my home because my home is too far away from the parole office
- whatever is convenient for me and my parole officer
- my boss knows I'm on parole and the parole officer can visit me at work

- when I was on parole in Victoria, most of the interviews were in the office...I never liked it...it was like going to jail...the other contacts were in a restaurant when the office was closed.

4 **What are the qualities that make your parole officer capable of doing the job of supervision? What qualities and abilities should your parole officer have?**

Responses:

- fair and understanding
- a good listener
- must be accessible
- open minded
- must be a "little suspicious and nosy" - "that is part of the job"
- should not be a former Correctional or Living Unit Officer as "they have no respect for my rights"
- must be honest with me
- should be of help to change my life style
- maybe should have a university degree in psychology or sociology
- reasonably educated; a liking for people; wanting to see people succeed; should have past experience in working with people
- has to be firm; lays out perameters; a good communicator; parolee should be able to discuss problems with his parole officer without feeling he will be sent back (to prison)
- must have trust in parolees; must have interest in work
- parole officer must use judgment in being able to make decisions on biased reports; should not act too quickly without hearing parolee's side; should give the parolee a warning first on "small" violations of conditions, then if it continues, he/she should be strict and sent the person back

- should have previous experience with prisoners; he/she should have a stable background; be able to deal with parolees as individuals

- a good training for the job

- "I view my parole officer almost like a friend..."

- the parole officer must be able to see me as an individual; when I was in prison, all of us were treated the same way

- maybe some parole officers could be ex-offenders as they would know what it's like in prison

- a background in social work would be good

- parole officer should be prepared to listen to the parolee admit "slips" in the parole conditions and be accepting

5 **What kinds of knowledge should your parole officer have about the community where you live and the kinds of help or services that you may require?**

Responses

- should have good contacts with agencies and know whether the agencies offer suitable programs

- should have a good idea of what is available for alcoholics

- should know how the neighbourhood feels about ex-cons

- should know how to get parolees enrolled in OHIP (Ontario Hospital Insurance Plan), C.E.I.C. and schools

- my parole officer got me into a good boarding house

- should have a good knowledge of services available

- should have a good idea of the area

- should know the area as to people..."whether there are a lot of criminals hanging around"

- should know what is available for leisure time.

6(a) **Is your parole officer available to you 24 hours a day?**

Responses

- I don't think so
- not when I was on mandatory supervision (previously); the agency worker never mentioned it
- yes, I call the CSC office number and an answering service gets in touch with him
- parole officer gave me his home phone number; I also know of the supervisor being on call
- if not my parole officer, someone on the CSC office can be reached.

(b) **Have you ever had to get in touch with your supervisor after regular office hours?**

- no
- don't see need for supervisor being available; if problems on the week-end, I would rather talk to my family
- yes; to get permission to travel on the week-end
- yes; when I was on a T.A. (Temporary Absence) and the bus was delayed getting back to Kingston. I didn't want to be U.A.L. (Unlawfully At Large) from the institution ...I called my supervisor who said that she would tell the institution
- no; any problems can be handled by support systems
- yes. At one time I wanted to leave the program (i.e., leave facility) because it wasn't fitting in.

7. **Have you ever been suspended? On what grounds should your parole officer recommend your suspension?**

- never been suspended
- suspended once on this day parole when I had been drinking and charged with assault

- parole should be suspended if the parole conditions are broken
- parole should be suspended if the police lay charges against the parolee
- parole should not be suspended for a violation of a special condition, e.g., abstain from alcohol, the parole officer should get the cooperation of the parolee to try Antabuse
- parole should be suspended after the parolee has been given a warning
- if parolee is heading for "self-destruction", e.g., drinking continuously, then a suspension will get him off the street
- if parolee caught with an illegal substance (e.g., drugs)
- on "suspicion" of drinking (violation of abstinence clause)
- any charge of violence
- "temporary suspension" for 30 days to get a parolee's attention and remind him that he is still serving a sentence
- should be suspended for not reporting to parole officer

8 **Do you think that everyone should be supervised in the same way, or do different people require different kinds and amounts of supervision? What should the differences be?**

Responses

- not everybody needs to be seen as frequently. Maybe everyone, though, should be seen by the parole officer at least twice a week for the first month
- everybody is different; we're doing time for different crimes; controls on parolees need to be different
- if I had not received parole to come to this halfway house, I would have been back with my friends

- you have to supervise people differently; for example, I'm a lot different person now than I was five years ago when I was on probation

- some parolees need to be seen by their parole officer more often than others because they (parolees) need to be reminded they are still on parole

- the number of times a parolee should be seen by the parole officer should be the decision of the parole officer, not the Parole Board

- every case is different. I've seen a lot of bad people in prison and I've met some guys who were trying to go straight

- if a parolee settles down and is working steadily then he might only be seen once a month; if he's not working maybe he should be seen twice a month

- drug addicts and alcoholics should seek treatment

- sex offenders/violent criminals should be seen more often by the parole officer than, for example, a person doing time for break-and-enter

- if a parolee is serious about giving up drugs, he should be tested regularly by urinalysis.

9 **Is there anything else that you want to tell us about supervision?**

Responses

- would not want to see any changes in the present system

- supervision can work with dedicated supervisors

- mandatory supervision should be abolished. Years ago I did not have to do my "good time" on supervision

- people should know in this city that not all of us who are in halfway houses are serving time for rape or violent offenses

- I find a difference in expectations from my CSC parole supervisor and the director of the halfway house. When I lost my job, my parole officer told me to take my time finding the right job but the house expects me to get a job as soon as possible

- my parole officer saved my life. I'm an alcoholic and I'd probably would have drunk myself to death by now if he hadn't got me into this program and the right boarding house

- parole officers are different. My first parole officer was like my mother, "do this, don't do that" and "do what I say". Since the change (in parole officers), my new officer let's me make more decisions for myself

- this type of supervision is different than when I was on probation. It was too easy on probation...interviews with my probation officer were always arranged one night a month at the office...I often never showed up but nothing happened to me

- maybe it would be worthwhile to have the inmate and the parole officer meet in prison before the parole. It would help in getting acquainted

- was supervised before on M.S. (Mandatory Supervision) by private agency. They had more "time" for me. Were not as strict

- halfway houses are a good way to begin on parole

- in the first interview the conditions of parole should be reviewed

- when I was in prison, I had five different case managers and found this hard to get used to

- everybody in prison is warehoused; supervision on the street should be more personalized

- certain guys get parole who shouldn't. If an inmate says all the right things and jumps through the hoops inside, then the chances are good of getting parole. In living unit institutions, it's the L.U.O. (Living Unit Officer) who knows the inmate best. The guards don't know the inmates in maximum (security institutions)

- parole officers should emphasize the positives in a parole situation; they also should tell the parolee that he is responsible for his own actions.

APPENDIX A
Written Responses to Project Discussion Paper

1. District Director, C.S.C.(P), Saskatchewan
2. District Director, C.S.C.(P), Western Ontario
3. District Director, C.S.C.(P), Nova Scotia
4. District Director, C.S.C.(P), East Quebec
5. Vancouver Police Department, Chief Constable's Office
6. National Parole Board, Atlantic Region, Moncton
7. Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa
8. Union of Solicitor General Employees
9. Drumheller Institution, C.S.C.
10. District Director, C.S.C.(P), Alberta/Northwest Territories
11. Operation Springboard, Toronto
12. Matsqui Institution, C.S.C.
13. Edmonton Institution, C.S.C.
14. C.S.C. RHQ, Prairie Region
15. Laval Institution, C.S.C.
16. Springhill Institution, C.S.C.
17. Area Manager, C.S.C.(P), Langelier
18. Yukon - Community Corrections
19. Court of Queen's Bench, Family Division, Newcastle, N.B.
20. Saskatchewan - Corrections
21. Nova Scotia, Attorney General's Department
22. C.S.C. RHQ, Atlantic Region
23. Regional Psychiatric Centre, C.S.C. Prairie Region
24. Alberta Solicitor General, Correctional Services
25. Ottawa-Hull Victims of Violence
26. Dorchester Penitentiary, C.S.C.
27. C.S.C. RHQ, Ontario Region
28. Atlantic Institution, C.S.C.
29. Board of Parole, Province of British Columbia
30. Exodus Link Corporation, Toronto
31. Saskatchewan Penitentiary, C.S.C.
32. District Director, C.S.C.(P), Manitoba
33. John Howard Society of Ontario
34. Area Manager, C.S.C.(P), Ottawa
35. National Parole Board, Pacific Region, Vancouver
36. National Parole Board, Prairie Region, Saskatoon
37. Canadian Association Chiefs of Police and Federal Corrections Services, Southern Alberta District
38. Native Counselling Services of Alberta
39. John Howard Society of Brandon
40. John Olver, Vancouver
41. Montée St. François Institution, C.S.C.
42. John Howard Society of Alberta
43. Salvation Army Correctional Services Department
44. Association des Services de Rehabilitation Sociale du Quebec, Montreal
45. Maison Saint-Laurent, Montreal

APPENDIX B

Consultation Workshop, Ottawa, January 15, 1988

Participants

1. Elizabeth Fabiano, C.S.C. NHQ
2. Anita Huber, student, Carleton University
3. Mike Johnstone, CSC NHQ
4. David Pisapio, CSC NHQ
5. Ken Baughan, CSC (P), Ottawa
6. Pierre St. Onge, CSC (P), Hull
7. Neeve Walsh, CSC NHQ
8. Marie-Andrée Drouin, CSC (P), Ottawa
9. Millard Beane, CSC NHQ
10. Janice Russell-Quinn, CSC NHQ
11. Diane McConkey, NPB NHQ
12. Guy Petit-Clair, NPB NHQ
13. Lee McMillan, CSC NHQ
14. Louis Brunet, CSC NHQ

Project Team

John Lawrence
Ana Paquete
Len Epp
Ted Wilson
Chris Trowbridge

Consultant

Don Storch

Consultation Workshop, Halifax, January 25, 1988

Participants

1. Erv Williams, NPB Moncton
2. David White, Correctional Services - Solicitor General, Nova Scotia, Halifax
3. Everett Harris, Family Service of Eastern Nova Scotia, Port Hawkesbury
4. Terry Carlson, John Howard Society of Newfoundland, St. John's
5. Bill Bastarache, John Howard Society of New Brunswick, Saint John Branch, Saint John
6. Kevin Bonner, John Howard Society of New Brunswick, Saint John
7. Michael Hornyak, New Brunswick Corrections, Moncton
8. R. Edward Wiggan, New Brunswick Corrections, Moncton
9. Major Harold Peckford, Salvation Army, Halifax
10. Pat Murphy, Heritage Court, Moncton
11. Marc Brideau, CSC (P), Saint John
12. John Gillis, CSC (P), Moncton
13. Charlie Leblanc, CSC (P), Halifax
14. Christine Manuge, CSC Springhill Institution
15. Peter Grandy, John Howard Society of Nova Scotia, Halifax
16. Wayne Struthers, CSC Halifax
17. Kathie Newman, CSC Dorchester Penitentiary
18. Susan Baglole, John Howard Society of Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown
19. Melody Lane Gay, John Howard Society of Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown
20. Carl E. Doucette, Probation, Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown
21. Elmer Allain, Police Department, Moncton
22. Gerald Greene, NPB Moncton
23. Daniel Vautour, CSC Atlantic Institution
24. Vince MacDonald, CSC (P), Halifax
25. Dave Matthews, CSC (P), Sand River
26. Brendan Devine, CSC (P), St. John's
27. Terry Mahoney, CSC (P), Truro
28. Paul Gallagher, John Howard Society, Halifax
29. John MacDougall, CSC (P), Sydney
30. Bob MacDonald, John Howard Society of Nova Scotia, Halifax
31. Robin Babmian, CSC RHQ, Moncton
32. Mary Casey, Citizens' Advisory Committee, CSC, Halifax

Project Team

John Lawrence
Len Epp
Chris Trowbridge

Consultant

Don Storch

Consultation Workshop, Toronto, January 27, 1988

Participants

1. David Moulton, Salvation Army, Toronto
2. Gaston St. Jean, Canadian Criminal Justice Association, Ottawa
3. Jane Fjeld, Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa, Ottawa
4. Chris Marr, CSC Prison for Women
5. Marguerite Brenton, Elizabeth Fry Society of Peel-Halton, Brampton
6. John Currie, CSC (P), Toronto
7. Dale McLees, CSC (P), Sudbury
8. Ian Clark, Salvation Army, Barrie
9. Craig Townson, CSC (P), Guelph
10. G.F. Minard, CSC (P), Hamilton
11. Derek Orr, CSC (P), St. Catharines
12. Marie-Andrée Drouin, CSC (P), Ottawa
13. Alex MacNair, CSC Pittsburgh Institution
14. John Phelan, Salvation Army, Toronto
15. Barry Friel, CSC Collins Bay Institution
16. Monty Bourke, CSC Frontenac Institution
17. Marty Silverstein, CSC, Regional Treatment Centre
18. John Harman, CSC Joyceville Institution
19. Joe Beatty, CSC Millhaven Institution
20. Rhoda Weltman, Ontario Board of Parole, Toronto
21. Sharon Sawatzky, Elizabeth Fry Society of Toronto, Toronto
22. Ian Carmichael, CSC (P), Etobicoke
23. Donna Reznick, Operation Springboard, Toronto
24. Neeve Walsh, CSC NHQ, Ottawa
25. Tom Dykstra, John Howard Society, London

Project Team

John Lawrence
Len Epp
Ana Paquete
Chris Trowbridge

Consultant

Don Storch

Consultation Workshop, Toronto, January 28, 1988

Participants

1. Diane Doherty, CSC (P), Toronto
2. Allan Smith, CSC (P), Peterborough
3. Jane Miller-Ashton, Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, Toronto
4. Bonnie Diamond, Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies, Ottawa
5. Carol Sparling, NPB, Kingston
6. Thomas Allgoewer, Exodus Link Corporation, Toronto
7. Hal Roach, CSC Beaver Creek Institution
8. Michael Lefebvre, CSC Warkworth Institution
9. Joan Brown, John Howard Society of K-W, Kitchener
10. Ruby Doddridge, CSC (P), Scarborough
11. Ian MacCormack, Salvation Army, Brantford
12. Joanne Link, St. Leonards Society of Brant, Brantford
13. June M. Blackburn, CSC Kingston Penitentiary
14. P.J. Longarini, Union of Solicitor General Employees, Kingston
15. J.W. Hewitt, Union of Solicitor General Employees, Ottawa
16. Trish Crawford, Elizabeth Fry Society, Kingston
17. Michael Jones, CSC (P), Kingston
18. Jim McClatchie, John Howard Society of Canada, Ottawa
19. Bill Sparks, John Howard Society of Ontario, Toronto
20. Wally Bunton, Salvation Army, Toronto
21. Barbara Hill, Elizabeth Fry Society, Hamilton
22. Lianne Bond, Salvation Army, Ottawa
23. Dolores Bryant, CSC (P), London
24. Dave Edwards, Durham Region Police Department, Oshawa
25. Rick Collett, Metro Toronto Police Department, Toronto
26. Neeve Walsh, CSC NHQ

Project Team

John Lawrence
Len Epp
Ana Paquete
Chris Trowbridge

Consultant

Don Storch

Consultation Workshop, Winnipeg, February 1, 1988

Participants

1. Kathi Ross, CSC (P), Winnipeg
2. Maureen McMillan, Native Clan Organization, Winnipeg
3. Ron Ducharme, Native Clan Organization, Winnipeg
4. Ed Carleton, CSC (P), Winnipeg
5. John Bissett, NPB Saskatoon
6. Pam Lyon, CSC Stoney Mountain Institution
7. Dave Harder, Salvation Army, Prince Albert
8. Len Soiseth, CSC Regional Psychiatric Centre
9. Robert Hayes, CSC Saskatchewan Farm Annex
10. John Junker, CSC Saskatchewan Penitentiary
11. Bill Green, CSC RHQ, Saskatoon
12. Graham Reddoch, John Howard Society of Manitoba, Winnipeg
13. Nancy Persa, International Center, Winnipeg
14. Willy Carleton, John Howard Society, Winnipeg
15. Greg Graceffo, CSC (P), Regina
16. Peter Krawchuk, CSC (P), Winnipeg
17. Larry Wilson, Provincial Corrections - Saskatchewan, Regina
18. Tom Jennings, Manitoba Corrections, Winnipeg
19. Jack Buhlman, John Howard Society of Thunder Bay, Thunder Bay
20. Arla Gustafson, Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
21. Roger Loewen, John Howard Society, Brandon
22. Bart C. Hawkins, Dakota Ojibway Police Department, Brandon
23. Gord Holloway, CSC (P), Winnipeg
24. Ernie Carlton, Winnipeg Police Department, Winnipeg
25. Flo Arnaud, Manitoba Corrections, Winnipeg
26. Doug Hiltz, Salvation Army, Regina
27. Ron Trickett, Salvation Army, Winnipeg

Project Team

John Lawrence
Len Epp
Ana Paquete
Ted Wilson

Consultant

Don Storch

Consultation Workshop, Edmonton, February 3, 1988

Participants

1. Noel Day, Edmonton Police Department, Edmonton
2. Nora Lea Benson, Citizens Advisory Committee (CSC), Edmonton
3. Audrey Vanden Bosch, Elizabeth Fry Society, Calgary
4. Cecile Lord, Alberta Correctional Services, Edmonton
5. Bonnie Knox, Alberta Correctional Services, Calgary
6. John Bissett, NPB, Saskatoon
7. George Atkey, John Howard Society, Red Deer
8. Gordon Sand, John Howard Society, Calgary
9. Jacqueline Townsend, Alberta Seventh Step Society, Calgary
10. Tricia Smith, Elizabeth Fry Society of Edmonton, Edmonton
11. Sandra H. Harrison-Demich, Belmont Correctional Centre, Edmonton
12. Don G. Kynoch, Grierson Centre, Edmonton
13. Larry Beaton, Salvation Army, Calgary
14. Dave Chapman, CSC Edmonton Institution
15. Paulette Doyle, Alberta Correctional Services, Edmonton
16. Lanny Der, Alberta Correctional Services, Edmonton
17. Doug Kazulak, Alberta Correctional Services, Edmonton
18. Midge Ravensdale, Alberta Correctional Services, Edmonton
19. Herb Wytinck, CSC (P), Edmonton
20. Maureen Collins, John Howard Society, Edmonton
21. Michael Liknaitzky, John Howard Society of Alberta, Edmonton
22. Randy Sloan, Native Counselling Services, Edmonton
23. Patricia Gutwald, CSC Drumheller Institution
24. Howard Sapers, John Howard Society of Alberta, Edmonton
25. Jeff Christian, CSC (P), Edmonton

Project Team

John Lawrence
Len Epp
Daniel Hawe
Ted Wilson

Consultant

Don Storch

Consultation Workshop #1, Vancouver, February 4, 1988

1. Glen Angus, B.C. Corrections Branch, Vancouver
2. Mike Boire, NPB, Burnaby
3. Klaus Kohlmeyer, Elizabeth Fry Society, Vancouver
4. Maida Duncan, Elizabeth Fry Society, Vancouver
5. Susan McKechnie, Elizabeth Fry Society, Vancouver
6. Rolf D. Guenther, Salvation Army, Whitehorse
7. Bill Sim, Yukon Corrections Branch, Whitehorse
8. Fred Jackson, Salvation Army, Langley
9. Robert Dyck, Salvation Army, Vancouver
10. Jean B. McMurd, CSC (P), Vancouver
11. Bill Hesketh, John Howard Society, Vernon
12. Jack Cooper, B.C. Borstal Association, Vancouver
13. Paul Jacks, CSC (P), Abbotsford
14. Ron Johnson, CSC (P), New Westminster
15. Teal Maedel, CSC (P), Vancouver
16. Marian Yaremy, John Howard Society, Vancouver
17. Elaine Stoll, John Howard Society, Vancouver
18. Bernie Matthews, CSC (P), Vancouver
19. John Olver, Vancouver
20. W. Douglas-Dungey, St. Leonard's Society, North Vancouver
21. Brenda Lamm, CSC, Matsqui Institution
22. Bert Massiah, John Howard Society, Vancouver

Project Team

Len Epp
Joan Nuffield

Consultant

Don Storch

Consultation Workshop #2, Vancouver, February 4, 1988

Participants:

1. Walter Ruteck, CSC (P), Abbotsford
2. Ken Mattinson, CSC (P), Abbotsford
3. Dan Denis, CSC RHQ, Abbotsford
4. Gerry Ayotte, Catholic Charities, Vancouver
5. Tom Farrell, Catholic Charities, Vancouver
6. Chris Conway, CSC (P), Vancouver
7. Dennis Watts, CSC Kent Institution
8. Larry Pearson, John Howard Society, Kelowna
9. Paul Barnett, John Howard Society, Campbell River
10. R.E. Brown, CSC (P), Victoria
11. Lynne Hyatt, CSC (P), Prince George
12. George T. Barber, Salvation Army, Victoria
13. Harry Hickson, Salvation Army, Chilliwack
14. Glen Brown, CSC (P), Kamloops
15. Bob Yates, CSC (P), Abbotsford
16. Dave Owen, CSC (P), Abbotsford
17. Sherry Brown, CSC (P), Abbotsford
18. Bill Burkholder, CSC (P), Chilliwack

Project Team

John Lawrence
Ted Wilson

Consultation Workshop, Laval, March 4, 1988

Participants:

1. Jacques Déom, Carrefour Nouveau Monde, Montréal
2. Ken Wagar, Salvation Army, Montréal
3. Pierre Couturier, Centre des Service Sociaux du Montréal Métropolitain, Montréal
4. Martin Vauclair, Association des Services de Réhabilitation Sociale du Québec, Montréal
5. Francois Bérard, Maison St-Laurent, Montréal
6. Debbie Birrel, CSC Ville Marie, Montréal
7. Sylvie Girard, CRC Emmanuel Grégoire, Montréal
8. Akos Baktay, St. Leonard's Society, Montréal
9. Pierre Dupuis, John Howard Society, Québec
10. Patrick Altimas, John Howard House, Montréal
11. Claude Morin, CSC, Montee St. François, Laval
12. Denis Levesque, CSC, Langelier, Montréal
13. Pierre Saulnier, CSC, LaFontaine, Montréal
14. René Blain, Quebec Parole Board, Montréal
15. Guy Pellerin, Service de la Protection, Montréal
16. Roland Connolly, Citizens Advisory Committee, Ste-Anne-des-Plaines
17. Louisette Rousseau, CRC Painchaud, Québec
18. Carole Frechette, CRC Painchaud, Québec
19. Guy LeBlanc, CSC, Secteur Québec, Québec
20. Raymond Lussier, CSC Montréal-Metro, Montréal
21. Yvon Gaudreau, NPB, Montréal
22. Marcel Veilleux, CRC Emmanuel Grégoire, Montréal
23. Claude Lemieux, CSC, Ste-Anne-des-Plaines
24. Christine Cloutier, CSC RHQ Montréal
25. Jean-Marc Trudeau, CSC, RHQ, Montréal

Project Team

Guy Petit Clair, NPB, Ottawa
Drury Allen, CSC, Ottawa
Len Epp, CSC, Ottawa
Louis Brunet, CSC, Ottawa

APPENDIX C

Issues for Discussion at Regional Consultations:

Conditional Release Supervision Standards Project

Issue #1 How can we strike a balance between CSC's and NPB's need to be assured of quality supervision, on the one hand, and the need to preserve the independence and autonomy of the agency or organization it contracts with, on the other? (page 15)

Issue #2 Is it necessary to have all contracting agencies and provinces agree to a single set of standards, or would it be sufficient for the Ministry to articulate its own standards and simply ensure that contracting agencies' internal standards and practices are consistent with and do not contradict those of the Ministry? (page 16)

Issue #3 Should there be special standards for special offender groups (Natives, women offenders, in rural areas)? (page 16)

Issue #4 Should supervision standards set the "minimum" standard or "standards of excellence"? (page 18)

Issue #5 What is the best way to articulate standards concerning the quality or content of supervision? (page 23)

Issue #6 Should there be an explicit authority for making exceptions to a standard in certain circumstances? (page 27)

Issue #7 How should the standards address frequency-of-contact? (Page 30)

Issue #8 What should standards say about collateral contacts and home and community visits? (page 32)

Issue #9 How should the standards address the gathering and sharing information? (Page 33)

Issue #10 How should the standards address twenty-four hour availability of supervision? (Page 34)

Issue #11 How should the standards address police liaison? (page 35)

Issue #12 What standards should govern the use of volunteers in supervision? (Page 36)

Issue #13 What standards should address the selection and training of supervisors? (page 36)

Issue #14 How should standards address the parole officer's brokerage role? (page 38)

Issue #15 What should standards say about case conferencing and quarterly reports? (page 39)

Issue #16 What should standards say about criteria for suspension of conditional release? (page 40)

NOTE: Page references from "Discussion Paper".

APPENDIX D

Initiatives as Reported by CSC and NPB at Workshops

Standing Committee - Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General (House of Commons).

David Daubney, M.P., Chairman of the Standing Committee, has been directed by the government to undertake a comprehensive review of sentencing and conditional release.

The review has been prompted, in part, by the publication of the Correctional Law Review's working paper entitled Conditional Release, published in March of 1967, the report of the Canadian Sentencing Commission entitled Sentencing Reform: A Canadian Approach, published in February of 1987 and released in March of 1987. In addition, the Committee is to consider the Report of the Solicitor General of the Task Force to Study the Recommendations of the Inquest into the Death of Celia Ruygrok.

The Committee will hold public hearings and visit parole/CSC regional operations.

National Parole Board - Pre-Release Decision Policies

The policies apply only to pre-release reviews: a set of post-release decision policies is being developed for review by the March 1988 NPB Senior Management Committee.

A summary of the policies is being developed for sharing with all offenders by the Case Management Team and will be provided by the Board shortly.

In addition, a comprehensive information package is being developed for the police, judiciary, provinces, private agencies and other Criminal Justice System components. Also, a question and answer booklet is being drafted in order to assist in responding to some of the issues that are likely to arise.

Sentence Management Review - Final Report, January 15, 1988

In July, 1987, the Solicitor General of Canada issued the Report of the Task Force to Study the Recommendations of the Inquest into the Death of Celia Ruygrok. Arising out of the tragic murder of a worker at a private halfway house in Ottawa, this Task Force tackled the issues raised by this incident and by the investigation into it by the Coroner's jury in the case.

The July 1987 Report, all of whose recommendations were accepted by the Solicitor General, outlined various initiatives which were considered necessary in the immediate and short term in order to address the weaknesses in the system which were revealed by this incident and the inquiries into it. However, it was acknowledged that other aspects of the jury recommendations required more in-depth consideration and follow-up over the medium- to long-term future. It is those longer-term issues which are the subject of this Sentence Management Review - Report to the Solicitor General of Canada.

There are three detailed action plans in the January 1988 Report dealing with the categories of information, case planning and release decision-making, and programs. Themes that have been addressed include developing information-sharing partnershiips, distinguishing between violent and non-violent offenders, building the professionalism of staff, continuity in case planning and implementation, and increasing the quality of decisions.

Community Residential Facilities (CRF) Standards

A set of standards for community residential facilities was approved by the CSC Senior Management Committee in November 1987 and the standards will come into effect on April 1, 1988. This achievement was made possible by the collective efforts of a team of CSC staff, consultants, the Canadian Criminal Justice Association, and many representatives from the private sector. The standards were developed and revised, on several occasions through consultation and negotiation with the private sector.

Standards and Guidelines for Case Management

The Offender Management Division at CSC National Headquarters published and distributed this document on February 1, 1988. These standards and guidelines are to be used as a tool in the case management of all offenders under CSC supervision both in institutions and in the community. A major component of the standards includes detailed reference to the Case Management Strategies approach to the identification of needs, development of correctional treatment plans and the selection of intervention strategies in the supervision of offenders.

APPENDIX E

Glossary of Terms

Auditing Method - a systematic procedure for checking compliance to the standards and guidelines.

Conditional Release - Release from a correctional facility on unescorted temporary absences, day parole, parole or mandatory supervision pursuant to the provisions of the Parole Act and Regulations and subject to specific terms and conditions.

Guidelines - statements of philosophy or intention, preferred practices or courses of action. Guidelines are optional.

Manager - the Area Manager, Section Supervisor or Superintendent of a Community Correctional Centre and the equivalent in a provincial or private sector agency to whom the parole supervisor reports.

Parole Supervisor - an individual who has been assigned the responsibility to supervise a conditionally released inmate. Depending on the agency in question this person may also be known as a parole officer, case worker, case management officer, etc.

Standards - essential requirements for performance and practice. Standards are mandatory, must be attainable and will be subject to audit.

Supervision - control and assistance activities by the parole supervisor related to the supervision of conditionally released inmates.

Volunteer - an individual who donates time and effort to assist an agency and a released offender.

APPENDIX F

Questions Asked of Inmates on Conditional Release

1. Do you think your parole officer has enough authority to make or recommend changes in the conditions and requirements of the supervision order under which you are released?

2. How often do you see your parole officer?

3. (a) Where do you usually meet? (b) Does it matter whether you meet in the office, or in your home, or in a public place? (If on day parole, ask this question of inmate in reference to when he is released on full parole or madatory supervision to the community.)

4. What are the qualities that make your parole officer capable of doing the job? What qualities and abilities should a parole officer have?

5. What kinds of knowledge should your parole officer have about the community where you live and the kinds of help or services that you may require?

6. (a) Is your parole officer available to you 24 hours a day? (b) Have you ever had to get in touch with your parole officer after regular office hours?

7. Have you ever had your conditional release suspended? On what grounds should your parole officer recommend your suspension?

8. Do you think every parolee should be supervised in the same way or do different people require different kinds and amounts of supervision? What should the differences be?

9. Is there anything else you want to tell us about supervision?

APPENDIX G

Parolee Interviews: First Names, Locations and Dates

Date	Name	Location
February 22, 1988	Mike, Dan, Brian, John	Toronto, Ontario
February 22, 1988	Brian	Kingston, Ontario
February 23, 1988	Peter, Bill, Mark, John, Don	Hamilton, Ontario
February 25, 1988	Gerry, Tas, Robert	Guelph, Ontario
February 25, 1988	Vince, Larry, Abdul	Brampton, Ontario
February 26, 1988	Dan	Kingston, Ontario
February 26, 1988	Gary	Guelph, Ontario

APPENDIX H

Project Team Members

John Lawrence
Correctional Service of Canada
40 Baker Street, Suite 101
Guelph, Ontario
N1H 4G1
Telephone: (519) 821-2250

Peter Cummings
National Parole Board
9th Floor, 340 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0R1
Telephone: (613) 995-1308

Ana Paquete
Correctional Service of Canada
2nd Floor, 340 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P9
Telephone: (613) 995-7770

Len Epp
Correctional Service of Canada
2nd Floor, 340 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P9
Telephone: (613) 992-8415

Dru Allen
Correctional Service of Canada
2nd Floor, 340 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P9
Telephone: (613) 992-8261

Daniel Hawe
Correctional Service of Canada
4th Floor, 340 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P9
Telephone: (613) 992-2165

Joan Nuffield
Ministry Secretariat
11th Floor, 340 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P8
Telephone: (613) 992-2810

Chris Trowbridge
National Parole Board
86 Clarence Street
Kingston, Ontario
K7L 1X3
Telephone: (613) 545-8351

Ted Wilson
National Parole Board
9th Floor, 340 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0R1
Telephone: (613) 995-1308

Consultant:

Don Storch
3912 - 120th St.
Edmonton, Alberta
Telephone: (403) 434-9843